

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-24 and 27-33 are pending in the application. Claims 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mayer, III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,692,337; hereinafter “Mayer”). Claims 1 and 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer. Claims 3, 6, 9-11, 15 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer in view of Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,344,836; hereinafter “Suzuki”). Claims 2, 8, 16-18 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer in view of Inbar (U.S. Patent No. 6,119,380; hereinafter “Inbar”). Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer in view of Yoshida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,617,112; hereinafter “Yoshida”). Claims 13-14, 20-23 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer in view of Berman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,448,956; hereinafter “Berman”). Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer and Suzuki and further in view of Inbar. Applicant submits the following arguments in traversal.

Rejection of Claims 29-31 under § 102(e) by Mayer

Applicant submits that claim 29 is patentable because each and every element of the claim is not disclosed or suggested by Mayer. Mayer discloses a control unit which may be either “mounted on” the chassis 201, the base 212 or the support 210. Not only does Mayer fail to expressly disclose the control unit being mounted inside the chassis 201, base 212 or the support 210, there is nothing in Mayer which provides a basis to reasonably support the determination that the control unit is necessarily incorporated in the chassis 201, base 212 or the support 210. See MPEP 2112 (IV). The mounting on a control unit or a chassis, such as a

separate unit disposed outside the chassis corresponds to a structure altered from that described by the claims. The Examiner cannot ignore the claimed relationship of the control unit being incorporated in the chassis. Therefore, claim 29 is not anticipated by Mayer.

Applicant submits that claims 30 and 31, which depend from claim 1, are patentable for at least the below reasons submitted for claim 1.

In addition, Applicant submits that claim 31 is patentable. The entire Mayer reference is directed to having multiple display panels disposed at angles to each other. Therefore, Mayer cannot possibly disclose or suggest a system wherein each of said plurality of flat panel displays has a viewing direction normal to a viewing surface and wherein viewing directions of said plurality of flat panel displays are substantially parallel. Rather, the viewing angles intersect in the teachings of Mayer. See Fig. 3. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to address these arguments in the next Action regarding the patentability of claim 31.

Rejection of Claims 1 and 4-5 under § 103(a) over Mayer

Applicant maintains that claim 1 is patentable. Applicant points out that the Examiner still has not responded to this argument that the Examiner does not provide the necessary motivation to modify the claimed features regarding display screen size, pixel size, the number of pixels, and aspect ratio. Without providing the necessary motivation, the Examiner does not have the necessary basis for characterizing the claims as being obvious.

Moreover, the Examiner's reliance on the Rose and Reven cases are inappropriate. Each are purported to support the proposition that a range determination is within the level of skill in the art. However, Reven makes clear that selection of a sub-range within a larger range does not confer patentability of the sub-range. However, in the present rejection, the Examiner has not

identified any teaching of the described ranges as claimed. A general reference to design choice is inadequate to address the rejection here.

Since the Examiner has not shown how the aforementioned features of the invention are result-effective variables, the Examiner's allegation that the change in range is within the level of ordinary skill in the art, is without support. See MPEP 2144.05(II)(B). Applicant requests the Examiner to specifically address this deficiency in the rejection of claim 1 in the next Action as the Examiner has failed to do so in the Final Office Action.

Claims 4 and 5, which depend from claim 1, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1.

Rejection of Claims 3, 6, 9-11, 15 and 24 under § 103(a) over Mayer in view of Suzuki

Claims 3, 6, 9-11, 15 and 24, which depend from claim 1, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Suzuki fails to make up for the deficiencies of Mayer.

Rejection of Claims 2, 8, 16-18 and 32 under § 103(a) over Mayer in view of Inbar

Applicant submits that claims 2, 8, 16-18 and 32, which depend from claim 1, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1.

In addition, Applicant submits that claim 32 is patentable because Inbar fails to teach, suggest or provide motivation for a system wherein a luminance measurement apparatus which measures a luminance gradation characteristic of each of said plurality of flat panel displays. Rather, the sections of Inbar cited by the Examiner on page 7 of the Office Action make no mention regarding any sort of a measurement of luminance.

Rejection of Claim 12 under § 103(a) over Mayer in view of Yoshida

Claim 12, which depends from claim 1, is patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Yoshida fails to make up for the deficiencies of Mayer.

Applicant also submits that claim 12 is patentable because Yoshida fails to teach, suggest or provide motivation for a system wherein in accordance with measurement results of luminance gradation characteristics of each of said plurality of flat panel displays, which is individually measured, maximum luminance values of all of said plurality of flat panel displays are set to a predetermined value equal to or smaller than a maximum luminance value of a flat panel display in which the maximum luminance value is lowest, and middle range of the luminance gradation characteristics of all of said plurality of flat panel displays are adjusted. In fact, Fig. 4 of Yoshida cited by the Examiner merely discloses having different examples of brightness control for different environmental light conditions. Nowhere is there any mention of varying the brightness control based on the luminance characteristics of a plurality of displays. Therefore, the combination of Mayer and Yoshida cannot possibly teach, suggest or provide motivation for the recitations of claim 12. **Applicants respectfully requests the Examiner to address these arguments in the next Action regarding the patentability of claim 12.**

Rejection of Claims 13-14, 20-23 and 27-28 under § 103(a) over Mayer in view of Berman

Claims 13-14, 20-23 and 27-28, which depend from claim 1, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Berman fails to make up for the deficiencies of Mayer.

Rejection of Claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mayer, Suzuki and Inbar

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. APPLN. NO.: 09/965,890

ATTY DOCKET NO.: Q63866

Claim 33, which depends from claim 1, is patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER


Susan P. Rao
Registration No. 41,239

Date: August 14, 2006